



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/975,982	11/21/1997	MARTINE CERUTTI	989.6442	1310

22469 7590 04/23/2003

SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS, LLP  
1600 MARKET STREET  
SUITE 3600  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

GUZO, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/975,982

Applicant(s)

CERUTTI ET AL.

Examiner

David Guzo

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1636

### **Detailed Action**

This is a SUPPLEMENTAL ACTION necessitated by the examiner's inadvertent omission (in the Office Action mailed 3/7/03) of the necessary paragraphs concerning whether the 6,312,690 patent would form the basis for a rejection under 35 USC 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 USC 102(f) or (g). This is necessary because the inventorship of the 6,312,690 patent (which claims an invention not patentably distinct from the instant invention) is different from the inventive entity of the instant application and there is no evidence of common ownership at the time the invention was made. This Office Action is supplemental to the Office Action mailed 3/7/03.

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on 1/31/94. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the French application (94/01015) as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b). Additionally, since intervening art has been applied in a 102(a) rejection, a translation of the foreign priority document may be necessary to overcome the rejection.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

---

Art Unit: 1636

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Carayannopoulos et al.

Applicants and Carayannopoulos et al. (PNAS, August 1994, Vol. 91, pp. 8348-8352, see whole article, particularly the Abstract, the "Materials and Methods" section on p. 8348 and the first four paragraphs of the "Results" section) recite an immunoglobulin produced in insect cells using a baculovirus expression vector wherein the constant domain sequence is of human origin. Carayannopoulos et al. therefore teaches the claimed invention.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 1636

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claim 11 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,312,690 (hereafter the '690 patent). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 11 is generic to all that is recited in claims 14-17 of the '690 patent. That is, claims 14-17 of the '690 patent fall entirely within the scope of claim 11 or in other words, claim 11 is anticipated by claims 14-17 of the '690 patent. Specifically, the recombinant monoclonal antibodies of human origin produced in insect cells using baculoviral vectors are encompassed within the instant claim reading on **any immunoglobulin** produced in insect cells using baculovirus vectors and whose constant domain is encoded by a sequence of human origin.

Claim 11 is directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 14-17 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent 6,312,690. Specifically, claim 11 is not patentably distinct for the reasons outlined in the above obviousness type double patenting rejection.

Art Unit: 1636

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302).

Commonly assigned U.S. Patent 6,312,690, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee is required under 37 CFR 1.78© and 35 U.S.C. 132 to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

Claims 1-10 and 12-15 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Guzo whose telephone number is (703) 308-1906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 1636

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, can be reached on (703) 305-1998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242. Faxes may be sent directly to the examiner at (703) 746-5061.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

David Guzo  
March 17, 2003

DAVID GUZO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*David Guzo*